

# Russia Rejects Talks On Anti-Missile Race

By Murrey Marder

Washington Post Staff Writer

The Soviet Union has ruled out for the present time the negotiations sought by the United States for limiting a nuclear anti-missile race, according to informed sources.

Premier Alexei N. Kosygin reportedly expressed that opposition to President Johnson during their two days of summit talks at Glassboro, N.J.

There was no official comment or public discussion on that or other specific topics in the summit conference from White House officials yesterday.

White House Press Secretary George Christian said only that the President watched Kosygin's televised press conference Sunday night, and that "generally his [Kosygin's] comments were similar to his expressions in the private conversations."

Some listeners construed what Kosygin said as leaving the Soviet position still dangling over whether it will or will not negotiate to avert multi-billion-dollar competition in an anti-ballistic-missile race. Others concluded that he was clearly sidestepping negotiations with the United States on this super-sensitive issue.

Kosygin stressed that the war in Vietnam "leaves its imprint on all relations" between the United States and the Soviet Union.

More specifically negative assessments and reports were received yesterday on the summit.

As several American experts saw the Soviet position, Kosygin was saying that the

Soviet Union regards it as untimely from its standpoint to plunge into substantive discussions about nuclear weapons with the United States with two major crises running in the world, the Middle East and Vietnam.

It was learned that Soviet Foreign Minister Andre Gromyko privately told other diplomats after the first summit talk on Friday that the Russians already have rejected the kind of talks proposed by the United States.

Gromyko's version was that the United States had offered to negotiate only on a technical level. The Soviet Union, he reportedly said, turned that down, because it wanted broad political talks on the total implications of nuclear weaponry.

That account conflicts with the U.S. version of where the anti-missile issue stood before the summit conference.

President Johnson publicly has said that the United States was fully prepared for broad talks. He said the United States would discuss not only its original proposal to avert a hugely costly race in anti-ballistic missile systems, but Premier Kosygin's counter-call last February for the need to discuss "offensive" weapons as well as "defensive" ones.

As the summit talks began last week, United States officials said they had asked the Soviet Union several times to fix a definite date for talks, after Soviet agreement in principle to discuss the problem. The Russians replied that they were still studying the

McNamara, who participated in the Glassboro talks, seeks to convince both Congress and the Soviet Union that a full anti-ballistic-missile race could cost each side up to \$60 billion with no real security gain to either party.

McNamara declined any comment on the subject yesterday, saying the release of summit information was a White House decision.

What Kosygin publicly said in New York Sunday night was similar to what he had said in London last February. He told questioners, after his ten hours of talks with the President, that the Soviet position on an anti-missile system "is well known." He said:

"We believe the discussions should center not only merely on the problems of an anti-missile system, because after all the anti-missile system is not a weapon of aggression, of attack, it is a weapon of protection—it's a defensive system."

Kosygin said "We feel, therefore, that what should be considered is the entire complex of armament-disarmament questions." He said that "otherwise, if instead of building and deploying an anti-ballistic missile system the money is used to build up defensive missile systems, mankind will not stand to gain anything," but will "face a still greater menace . . ."

The added stress that Kosygin put Sunday on "the whole range of questions relating to arms and disarmament," however, could be broad enough to swallow up in endless dispute the blanket subject of disarmament, rather than the narrower issue of "offensive and defensive" nuclear missiles.

problem, American officials said, while the United States stood "ready to proceed with substantive talks as soon as a date can be fixed."